

## **REMARKS**

### **Present Status of the Application**

Claims 1-3, 8-15, 21-25 and 30-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Greenberg (US Publication No.2003/0083577). Claims 4-7, 16-20 and 26-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Greenberg (US Publication No.2003/0083577) in view of Dominach (U.S. Publication No. 2004/0172258). Applicant respectfully traverses the preceding rejection based on the following arguments. For at least the foregoing reasons, applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-2, 4-14 and 16-34 patently define over prior art of record and reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

### **Discussion for “Response to Arguments”**

*Greenberg teaches image modification such as: image appearance or zoom in/out (paragraph [0036]) and using an editing operation, such as cut-paste, for an image. These examples describe excepting a command and modification and editing an image describe adjustment actions that are executed on Image*

In response thereto, applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner misconstrues the claimed fuzzy command to be identical to the command “use equation

A to calculate birth weight” as disclosed in paragraph [0036] in Greenberg. This is because it is well-known by people of ordinary skill in the art that the word “fuzzy” in the recitation of claimed “fuzzy command” means it has indefinite meaning. For example, as disclosed in paragraph [0054] in the specification, the command, “the image is blurring,” is a fuzzy command because the word “blurring” has indefinite meaning. Also, in other instances, the commands, such as “the image is too dark” or “the image is too bright” are fuzzy commands because the words “too dark” and “too bright” have indefinite meaning. However, in Greenberg, the command, “use equation A to calculate birth weight,” doesn’t contain word(s) that has indefinite meaning. Moreover, the Examiner alleged that the command “use equation A to calculate birth weight” as disclosed in paragraph [0036] in Greenberg, has the same function of performing a plurality of actions as claimed fuzzy command. However, applicants respectfully submit that in Greenberg, the plurality of actions are **mathematical actions**, which is totally different from claimed **adjustment** actions. Furthermore, from subject matter of claim 1, i.e. ”A method for adjusting images,” it is obviously that the claimed “**adjustment** actions” is referred to “image-adjusting” which is visible for a user, but the **mathematical** actions executed in Greenberg is not visible for the user. Hence, the command, “use equation A to calculate birth weight” as disclosed in Greenberg is not

the claimed fuzzy command at all. Thus, applicants respectfully submit that paragraph [0036] in Greenberg fails to disclose claimed fuzzy command.

**Discussion for rejection to claims under 35 U. S. C. 102(e)**

*Claims 1-3, 8-15, 21-25 and 30-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Greenberg (US Publication No. 2003/0083577).*

In response thereto, applicants respectfully traverses the preceding rejection based on the following arguments. First of all, to establish a prima facie case of anticipation, the cited reference (i.e. Greenberg) should teach all claim limitations.

The amended claims 1 and 13 are partly recited as follows:

1. A method for adjusting images, suitable for adjusting a video device with a voice-assisted system, said video device providing an on-screen display function, said method comprising:

identifying said voice command as one of a specific command and a fuzzy command based on said voice signal, wherein said fuzzy command performs a plurality of adjustment actions corresponding to said voice command, and if the adjusted image does not meet a user's expectation, the adjusted image is further modified based on the performed adjustment actions.

As set forth in Discussion for “Response to Arguments”, in Greenberg, the command, “use equation A to calculate birth weight,” can trigger the review system to perform requested calculation. And, the calculation(s) are referred to **mathematical actions**, which is totally different from claimed **adjustment actions**. This is because mathematical actions cannot achieve function of claimed “adjustment action,” such as adjusting contrast, brightness, color etc (see paragraph [0054] in the specification). Moreover, in Greenberg, the command, “use equation A to calculate birth weight,” doesn’t contain word(s) that has indefinite meaning so that this command cannot be regarded as claimed fuzzy command. Additionally, in Greenberg, when this command is used, the user must remember the default instruction of “equation A”. In contrast, in claims 1, 13, the user uses the fuzzy command without remembering such default instruction. Since Greenberg fails to disclose claimed fuzzy command, it doesn’t disclose the step of identifying voice command as one of a specific command and a fuzzy command, as claimed in claims 1 and 13.

Moreover, in Greenberg, after the command, “use equation A to calculate birth weight,” is performed, the result is placed to examination report (see lines 23-24, right column, page 3). In other words, the result is not re-confirmed by user; but in claims 1, 13, the result is further modified based on the performed adjustment actions if the result

does not meet a user's expectation.

In summary, Greenberg at least fails to teach, suggest or disclose "identifying said voice command as one of a specific command and a fuzzy command based on said voice signal, wherein said fuzzy command performs a plurality of adjustment actions corresponding to said voice command, and if the adjusted image does not meet a user's expectation, the adjusted image is further modified based on the performed adjustment actions," as claimed in the claims 1 and 13. In other words, the claims 1 and 13 are not anticipated by Greenberg and thus patentable.

Regarding dependent claims 2, 8-12, 14, 21-25, they should be patentable for the reason that they contain all limitations of their respective patentable base claims 1 and 13.

**Discussion for objection to claims under 35 U. S. C. 103(a)**

*4. Claims 4-7, 16-20 and 26-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Greenberg (US Publication No.2003/0083577) in view of Dominach (U.S. Publication No. 2004/0172258).*

In response thereto, applicant respectfully traverses the preceding rejections based on the following arguments. To establish a prima facie case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in

the reference themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the references or to combine references teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art references (i.e. Greenberg and Dominach) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations.

By applying the aforementioned arguments, since Greenberg fails to disclose claimed “fuzzy command” and the limitation “if the adjusted image does not meet a user’s expectation, the adjusted image is further modified based on the performed adjustment actions,” as claimed in claim 26, even if Greenberg and Dominach could be combined, this combination still fails to disclose the above underlined feature of claim 26. In other words, this combination fails to disclose all limitations of claim 26. Thus, claim 26 is patentable because a prima facie case of obviousness is not well established. Accordingly, regarding dependent claims 27-34, they should be patentable for the reason that they contain all limitations of their patentable base claim 26.

Regarding claims 4-7, 16-20, since they are dependent claims, they should be patentable as a matter of law for the reason they contain all limitations of their respective patentable base claims 1 and 13.

**CONCLUSION**

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is believed that all the pending claims 1-2, 4-14 and 16-34 of the present application patently define over the prior art and are in proper condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would expedite the examination of the above-identified patent application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

Date :

June 30 , 2008

Belinda Lee  
Belinda Lee

Registration No.: 46,863

Jianq Chyun Intellectual Property Office  
7<sup>th</sup> Floor-1, No. 100  
Roosevelt Road, Section 2  
Taipei, 100  
Taiwan  
Tel: 011-886-2-2369-2800  
Fax: 011-886-2-2369-7233  
Email: [belinda@jcipgroup.com.tw](mailto:belinda@jcipgroup.com.tw)  
[usa@jcipgroup.com.tw](mailto:usa@jcipgroup.com.tw)